

**STATE OF ALASKA
COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT**

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
August 4, 2009**

**Location
Department of Public Safety Headquarters
5700 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage, Alaska**

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chair Ann House called the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. on Tuesday, August 4, 2009. Seven Council members were present at roll call to form a quorum.

Council members present: **Ann House** (chair - public member); **Colonel Audie Holloway** (Department of Public Safety, AST); **Richard Svobodny** (Department of Law); **Stephanie McFadden** (public member); **Sam Norbert** (Department of Corrections); **Kristine Norbert** (public member); **Melissa Stone** (Department of Health & Social Services)

Council members absent: Cynthia Curran (DEED) and Susan Cushing (public member)

Council staff present: **Katie TePas**, Acting Executive Director; **Joanne Griggs** (Administrative Officer)

Others present (in person or by telephone): Dan Spencer (DPS Administrative Services)

COUNCIL CONFLICT INQUIRY

Chair House inquired if Council members had a potential conflict of interest with any items to be discussed at this meeting.

There were no conflict-of-interest disclosures.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

House Bill 63 expanded the number of members on the Council from seven to nine, adding a rural public member and a representative from the Department of Corrections.

Chair House welcomed the new Council members, including the person appointed to fill a vacant seat, and asked them to introduce themselves.

Kristine Norbert said she was a public member from Dillingham who worked at Health and Social Services (DHSS) and previously worked at the shelter for about four years.

Sam Edwards, deputy commissioner of the Alaska Department of Corrections, briefly described his service at DOC and said he was on the CDVSA legislative task force last year [that was charged with reviewing the effectiveness of the CDVSA].

Melissa Stone, director of Behavioral Health in DHSS for about two years, stated she was executive director of Seaview Community Services in Seward for roughly 14 years prior to that.

The other Council members and staff also introduced themselves.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as submitted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

COLONEL HOLLOWAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS THE APPOINTMENT FOR THE POSITION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PER ALASKA STATUTE 44.62.310(E), PERTAINING TO THE OPEN MEETINGS ACT. THIS TOPIC FALLS UNDER SUBSECTION (2) OF THAT STATUTE, AS A "SUBJECT THAT TENDS TO PREJUDICE THE REPUTATION AND CHARACTER OF ANY PERSON, PROVIDED THAT PERSON MAY REQUEST A PUBLIC DISCUSSION;..." MR. SVOBODNY SECONDED.

The motion carried unanimously. The Board convened in executive session at approximately 8:40 a.m. Ms. TePas indicated she would attempt to reach Council member Cynthia Curran by telephone so she could participate in the executive session discussion. Everyone not on the Council was asked to leave the room, and the recorder was turned off.

The Council came out of executive session and reconvened the regular meeting at ____ a.m. Melissa Stone was absent following the executive session but rejoined by telephone later.

Chair House announced that the Council made a decision on selecting a new executive director and intended to state the decision publicly after they had first spoken with the successful applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present in Anchorage or on line who wished to address the Council at the scheduled time on the agenda for public comment.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Acting executive director Katie TePas asked to move discussion of House Bill 63 and Staffing Update to the beginning of her report, and invited Dan Spencer, director of DPS Administrative Services, to participate in that update.

HB 63 and Staffing Update

House Bill 63 converted the CDVSA staff positions (except for the executive director) from exempt service to classified service. Ms. TePas explained that midway through the bill process there was some discussion about potential issues with staff positions in doing that, and the language was amended to fix some of the issues. When those positions moved over to classified, it was discovered that that did not happen. Since then DPS has been in discussions with the Department of Administration.

Mr. Spencer said he was not closely involved in this legislation, but it basically stated that existing CDVSA employees would be converted from exempt service to the classified service without experiencing a reduction in pay related to the conversion. However, at least one employee was classified at a lower range of pay and will have their pay "frozen" for as long as five years. He explained the factors related to the personnel rules governing classified employees and step increases that came into play in the conversion. *[Staff distributed two spreadsheets they had prepared specific to the four CDVSA positions affected, to illustrate Mr. Spencer's explanation.]* He stated that because the converted positions were classified back down to a step A, CDVSA employees will not get merit increases or cost-of-living allowances (COLA) until, through the passage of time and good service, the step levels catch up with their salaries. He said he understood this was not what some people expected, but that is the way the process normally works for the classified service. So while the legislation addressed the issue of employees not experiencing a pay reduction, the question of future step increases is another matter entirely.

Mr. Spencer mentioned that none of the current CDVSA employees were in a permanent full-time position with CDVSA at the time the positions were made exempt about six years ago. In the intervening period, the Department of Administration conducted a series of class studies in all the departments: all four of the CDVSA positions affected by HB 63 were subject to class studies during that time. Had those positions been classified, there is a chance they could have gone up or down. In converting the positions to classified service the Department of Administration applied the normal rules and froze the salaries. CDVSA employees were grandfathered into the new positions and did not have to compete.

Responding to Ms. McFadden's question about staff moral, Ms. TePas said she has spoken to them extensively: staff is extremely adamant that they thought the language in HB 63 was supposed to cover this and that their understanding of the reduction in pay provision was not what it turned out to be. Former executive director Chris Ashenbrenner's recollection of the discussions is similar to staff's. It appears that some discussions were informal or off the record so there is nothing in writing to refer to. The person who worked on the actual language in the

bill is on leave for a few weeks, so Ms. TePas was unable to have a conversation with him to get any clarity or to find out if he had backup notes of discussions that took place. Staff is very concerned about no future pay increases for quite a while.

Mr. Spencer answered several questions from Council members. *[Transcriber was unable to hear the questions on the recording or discern who the questioners were.]* Someone asked what his recommendation was, given the information available to date. Mr. Spencer responded that he did not really have a recommendation but he was sympathetic to the disappointed CDVSA employees. He sensed that the Department of Administration commissioner was not amenable to altering the position pay levels because the Legislature [took the action it did] and to do anything else would be a benefit to the CDVSA employees and not a *[unintelligible]*. If the Council wished to address the pay level issue, it probably would have to be through new legislation or via some reconsideration by the Department of Administration.

Ms. TePas informed the Council that two vacant positions were unaffected and would come in at the A step level when filled. Also, the business manager from GGU (which represents the CDVSA employees, except for the administrative officer in the supervisory union) contacted her expressing a willingness to write a letter of agreement saying that the union did not oppose a legislative fix.

Ms. McFadden asked for input about moral from a staff member. Ms. Griggs said the CDVSA has an excellent working team right now. She thought staff was keeping an optimistic attitude that the Council and the Department of Administration would resolve the pay issue.

Mr. Spencer said he wanted everyone to be clear that if an employee were to take a lateral move to a state position elsewhere the salary protection in place now would not transfer over to that new position and they would start as a step A somewhere else. CDVSA employees have a significant protection in their current positions, and they would have to have a significant promotion to not be harmed in the pay level. Ms. Griggs indicated that staff has had that discussion and they understand that. Mr. Spencer added that if an employee were to take a promotion they would get at least a one step increase.

Ms. TePas stated that both staff and the former executive director truly feel that what has happened was not going to happen, although they understood the broader notion of what it meant to move from exempt to classified service. Some of the conversations that needed to happen regarding range versus step and what it meant to have pay frozen were probably not as clear as they should have been. If staff had actually known what the outcome turned out to be, they might not have wanted to shift over to classified service: a five-year pay freeze is significant to an employee. She asked how the Council wished to proceed.

Ms. Norbert(?) said HB 63 should be amended.

Ms. McFadden inquired if that was the only way to get things changed. Mr. Spencer said yes, absent the Department of Administration commissioner, the director of the Division of

Personnel, and the Department of Law concurring that some other fix was possible.

Col. Holloway observed that the Department of Administration (DOA) was in a bad spot because it probably did not want to get into the business of making exemptions, so that the business of the state runs smoothly. The Council would have to go outside the system so that DOA had some protection as well. For that reason, he recommended writing a letter to Representative Anna Fairclough, one of the bill's sponsors, explaining what happened and asking the sponsors to bring some pressure to bear on correcting the situation or to amend the legislation. He said that his understanding from talking with the former executive director was that the Council was not recommending any change that would have caused any harm to the CDVSA employees: the current outcome causes employees harm.

Mr. Spencer pointed out that the Department of Public Safety has other employees whose positions were downgraded and whose pay level has been frozen until they catch up - not on the same scale as happened to CDVSA employees, but employees who are in a very similar situation. The Council has not heard what the DPS commissioner's position would be on the Council trying to make any changes for CDVSA staff.

Mr. Edwards inquired about the feasibility of the CDVSA employees reverting to exempt service if the majority of them wanted to. Mr. Spencer responded that DPS cannot place someone in the exempt service: that requires legislation. Even the Personnel Board cannot do that. Mr. Edwards said that leaves the Council with very few real options: the only bright spot is that the employees will catch up to their current pay level placement quicker as the pay steps rise with COLA adjustments.

Mr. Svobodny commented that the Council had discussions about moving employees from exempt to classified service, and nobody on the Council probably thought of the pay freeze issue. Unless it was legislative intent and not what Council members thought or what employees thought, it will not make any difference. If what employees are asking is that the language of a piece of legislation be changed because somebody off the record did not think about it, it will not go anywhere. His suggestion was to ask the executive director to brief the sponsor(s) of HB 63 and find out their intent. He guessed that the Department of Law's position on the matter would be that the DOA commissioner was right. He said he would have to think hard about how he would vote on the Council requesting amended legislation.

Ms. TePas said that she could pursue getting more information from those who authored the bill and report back at the September meeting.

Mr. Svobodny said one option would be for the Council to pass a resolution directed at the commissioner of the Department of Administration explaining the problem. However, he did not know if that would be worth a lot because the DOA commissioner is stuck with the law.

COLONEL HOLLOWAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL DIRECT THE ACTING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO CONTACT THE PERSON WHO DRAFTED HOUSE BILL 63

TO FIND OUT IF THERE WAS ANY RECORD OF CONVERSATIONS, THEN CONTACT THE LEGISLATORS WHO SPONSORED THE BILL, INCLUDING REPRESENTATIVE ANNA FAIRCLOUGH, TO LET HER KNOW THE SITUATION, AND PREPARE A LETTER FROM THE COUNCIL EXPLAINING WHAT THEY THOUGHT WOULD HAPPEN COMPARED TO WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED, AND REPORT BACK TO THE COUNCIL AT THE SEPTEMBER MEETING. MR. SVOBODNY SECONDED.

Mr. Svobodny said he did not know what effect that would have, but the Council should let the employees know that they are addressing the issue.

Ms. McFadden said it should go through the proper chain of command to the agencies that made the decision, because the representatives will have to go back and coordinate everything. Representative Fairclough did not make the decision to freeze CDVSA employees' pay: it is the state's process.

Roll call vote (chair votes only if there is a tie)

Ayes: McFadden, Holloway, Svobodny, Edwards, Norbert

Nays: None

The motion passed, 5-0.

Ms. TePas continued with other items under the Executive Director's Report.

Program Survey

Ms. TePas said there were brief discussions about doing a survey of the CDVSA-funded programs but no talk about how to label that survey. Statewide there has been a lot of discussion about need and capacity. Lauree Morton pulled some information for her regarding the strategic plan and prior conversations the Council had. The Council set aside \$75,000 to do a survey on minimum standards for shelters and non-residential programs. She wanted CDVSA to start working on developing that, in partnership with the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (ANDVSA), because CDVSA would obviously be surveying the Network's member programs. An ad hoc committee of both CDVSA staff and the Network programs will come up with a draft, although it is uncertain if that draft will be ready for Council review at its September meeting. The idea is to work with the University of Alaska Justice Center to compile the survey results and do some of the interpretations.

Ms. TePas stated that shelters have differing opinions on what core services are, so the survey will not be solely a survey of capacity but will also look at core services. This will enable the Council to start working on minimum standards, which is part of the strategic plan. She proposed starting work on that, with the understanding that the survey tool will not be implemented without the Council's approval. There will also be a contract for designing the survey that the Council will need to approve.

Mr. Edwards inquired if the survey was for all the CDVSA-funded programs. Ms. TePas said it

would specifically be a victim services program survey that would exclude batterers intervention programs. One reason is that the request for proposal (RFP) is out for the batterers intervention task force, so there will be an entirely separate working group dealing with that. That RFP will be closing soon.

Responding to Col. Holloway, Ms. TePas said staff will have to hold conversations with the shelter directors to help identify what core services are. Then staff will work with the contractor to design the survey tool to evaluate how those core services are doing. This may include shelter capacity, the number of beds and contingency beds, and staffing ratios. She added that several steps will have to happen to finish the project.

Col. Holloway asked if a motion was required. Ms. TePas said no.

Mr. Svobodny inquired if other states have done this type of survey. Ms. TePas replied that part of the initial assessment will be looking at the pros and cons of what other states have done.

Statewide Prevention Campaign

Ms. TePas stated that the CDVSA received \$159,000 in FY10 for violence prevention that is being contracted to the Network. They will be doing two campaigns in FY10: one is primary prevention and the second is for public awareness. The Council will be getting a report on that at a future meeting.

Program Compliance Update

Ms. TePas reported that the CDVSA office continues to have some issues with the Maniilaq Family Crisis Center (MFCC) in Kotzebue. The FY10 grant award documents were due at CDVSA on June 30, 2009, but the office has yet to receive all the correct documents. This type of issue with MFCC was documented at the last funding meeting, when specific questions regarding compliance with paperwork and budgets were asked of the program representatives. Those issues seem to be ongoing. She proposed adding to the September meeting agenda a discussion about how to intervene in situations like this sooner rather than later. "Intervene" can mean a variety of actions — holding back funding, limiting funding, etc.

Ms. Norbert asked if staff had visited Maniilaq lately. Ms. TePas replied not lately, but Linda Hoven is scheduled for a site visit in October. Although it is high on staff's priority list, the on-site has not been scheduled sooner because MFCC is without an executive director for the victim services program, and Ms. Hoven wanted to go there when someone was in place full time. Continuing her response to Ms. Norbert, Ms. TePas said the office does not have all the FY09 documents from MFCC yet so she could not adequately assess a whole year. Right now it is a paper issue, but it creates a problem for CDVSA staff in time used for contacts and reminders. Ms. Hoven is in fairly constant contact with MFCC.

Ms. McFadden asked what the harm would be in the executive director sending MFCC a letter saying that the program must get into compliance or it could lose its CDVSA funding. Ms. TePas said there is no harm in doing that, but it is a formal decision for the Council to make. Ms.

McFadden asked if the Council had to wait until the September meeting to take any action. Ms. Griggs stated that a situation in the past resulted in a reprimand to a program, and the Council established a procedure for handling these. She asked for time so that staff could research exactly what the Council had recommended at that time and bring it to the September meeting.

Ms. TePas stated that MFCC has not received their first quarter funding for FY10. Ms. Griggs confirmed that the funding would be held until _____. Ms. TePas said that in terms of service delivery she did not know what MFCC would be unable to do without that funding.

Ms. McFadden requested that if staff found out before the September meeting that the needs of victims in Kotzebue were not being met that staff notify Council members immediately. Ms. TePas said the office should receive the final reports for FY09 by August 17 and will be able to assess those. If staff sees any absolute emergency needs they will let the Council know.

Col. Holloway remarked that these kinds of things translate into funding decisions when it comes time to decide which programs get how much money. It would be nice to have clear rules — as much as possible, because this is not a hard-and-fast kind of business — so that it does not look like the Council is being punitive when it divides up the funding so much as it is being more responsible in making sure that money is sent to programs that are working. He did not want to see anybody suffering that has needs, but the CDVSA only has a certain amount of funding to award: if the money goes to programs that are not doing their job, it is not helping the most people.

Request For Support

Ms. TePas reported that Dr. Linda Chamberlain from the Department of Health and Social Services - Division of Public Health had sent a request to the Council for a letter of support for the division's budget request for \$300,000 for injury prevention and work with EMS. *[A copy of the DHSS budget request was provided to Council members.]* The services are prevention activities, which are part of the core services for the CDVSA and in the strategic plan. The Council has a history of collaborating with Dr. Chamberlain on a variety of different projects and issues.

Col. Holloway mentioned that responding to suicides and violent situations is a huge part of the Alaska State Troopers' costs. Anything that will target preventing those types of things will reduce AST's costs and so he supported what Public Health was proposing.

STEPHANIE MCFADDEN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL SUPPORT THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH'S BUDGET REQUEST FOR INJURY PREVENTION AND WORK WITH EMS. MR. SVOBODNY SECONDED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION.

Mr. Svobodny sought clarification that the paperwork from Public Health was not proposing any legislation but was strictly a budget issue. Ms. TePas said that Public Health was supposed to have submitted the proposal last Friday but she had not wanted to speak on the Council's behalf,

given her acting status. Mr. Svobodny expressed concern about the process [*not audible*] and that he would be unable to support the proposal without knowing exactly what it was.

Roll call vote (chair votes only if there is a tie)

Ayes: McFadden, Holloway, Edwards, Norbert

Nays: Svobodny

The motion carried, 4-1.

Ms. TePas indicated that she would get clarification from Public Health for Mr. Svobodny.

FEDERAL STIMULUS FUNDING

Mr. Svobodny reported that last year CDVSA was notified that it might not be in compliance with a Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) STOP grant because it might be that judges were not notifying people who were convicted of crimes of domestic violence that they could be prosecuted under federal law for possessing a firearm. The reality is that the court does not notify people of that because it is not the law. CDVSA explained that to the office administering the grant. Conversations took place since last year with VAWA people about this. The VAWA Office informed CDVSA in May 2009 that it was not in compliance and had two options — come into compliance or have a legal officer of the state provide the VAWA Office with a reason for the non-compliance. Mr. Svobodny took it upon himself to write a letter explaining that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals had said regarding law almost identical to Alaska's law on assaults that people could not be prosecuted federally if the offense was a misdemeanor. The response was that the FBI had given the VAWA Office legal advice and that Alaska was wrong even though there was the appeals court case. They also said that even if they were going to follow appeals court ruling and say that people who were convicted of crimes of domestic violence could not be prosecuted under federal law for possessing a firearm, state harassment charges in the Municipality of Anchorage and the Municipality of Juneau's disorderly conduct statutes would apply. He again wrote a letter showing some Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decisions saying that harassment and disorderly conduct are nuisance types of offenses and one could not lose one's right to bear arms for violations of those types.

Mr. Svobodny said the current status is no response to his May letter, but Alaska is one of three states that has not received notice that it would receive VAWA money coming from the Recovery Act. Alaska is not in compliance with the VAWA STOP grant and one of the reasons the state did not appear on the list of states receiving stimulus money was because it was being punished for not being in compliance. He said he suspected that the VAWA Office was going to stop the stimulus money without giving CDVSA any notification in writing and that the VAWA STOP formula grant funding was at risk also.

Mr. Svobodny stated that, since the VAWA Office was not conveying any information in writing, there were several ways the Council could go. One is to sue them. Generally, that means exhausting administrative remedies first, but since VAWA will not officially tell CDVSA that

they are stopping the grant money, the state has not exhausted those administrative remedies. Another way of proceeding is Sue McLean has talked to the Court System, which would stand to lose its 5% share of the VAWA funding, to see if they would be willing to put a notice on their web page saying to people convicted of harassment, disorderly conduct and assault in the fourth degree that it may be that they could be prosecuted under federal law for possessing a firearm. The Department of Law was told informally that that would probably work. But that could open the door to all the other issues of whether the state is in compliance. Another alternative is to ask Senators Murkowski and Begich to intervene.

FINANCIAL UPDATE

Ms. Griggs drew attention to a June 2, 2009 letter from the Department of Corrections - Division of Probation and Parole requesting \$73,000 for the salary of the criminal justice technician, an increase of \$18,100 over the previous year. She said she received the funding request after the CDVSA submitted its FY10 budget, but she had anticipated a request of \$55,000 and budgeted for it. She did not budget for an increase. She asked for Council approval to fund the reimbursable service agreement (RSA) with the Department of Corrections at \$55,000 with permanent fund dividend or VOCA (Victims of Crime Act) dollars, whichever staff determines is best for CDVSA.

The criminal justice technician position at DOC works with the victim notification system (VINE). The Council originally supported the position because so many victims of domestic violence rely on the VINE system to let them know what is happening to jailed perpetrators.

Col. Holloway suggested asking DOC to verify that the criminal justice technician was still being used for the original intent. If the function of that position has changed, the Council should know that before allocating money to it.

Ms. Stone indicated that she had joined the meeting again by teleconference.

Mr. Svobodny said he gathered that staff was not asking to increase the RSA by \$18,100. Ms. Griggs said that was correct. Mr. Svobodny asked if CDVSA had money in the budget to cover the increase if the Council wanted to fund it. Ms. Griggs replied that she would need time to re-do \$18,000 worth of administrative expenses.

Mr. Svobodny commented that although CDVSA has been funding this position for ten years it probably should stop doing so because it ought to be part of DOC's regular budget. He recommended paying the salary this year because DOC expects it, but asking the Department of Corrections to make the position a regular part of their budget.

Ms. Griggs clarified that her request to the Council was for permission to pay the \$55,000 RSA out of whichever CDVSA funding source was most appropriate.

Mr. Edwards observed that the request letter to CDVSA came directly from the VINE unit, and

he wondered how much the DOC administrative section knew about this funding arrangement.

Ms. Griggs said that prior to the last two or three years the letter arrived at CDVSA in time to be part of the Council's annual funding meeting. In more recent years she has had to call DOC and ask for the letter in order to prepare the RSA.

COLONEL HOLLOWAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL DO THE REIMBURSABLE SERVICE AGREEMENT [WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS TO PAY THE SALARY OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE TECHNICIAN] AT THE AMOUNT BUDGETED (\$55,000) AND THAT THE FUNDING COME OUT OF PERMANENT FUND DIVIDEND MONIES OR VOCA GRANT FUNDS. FURTHER, THAT THE COUNCIL REQUEST MR. EDWARDS TO GATHER INFORMATION ON THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS SIDE SO THE COUNCIL COULD REVISIT THIS LATER, IF NECESSARY. MR. SVOBODNY SECONDED.

Mr. Svobodny restated his recommendation that the Department of Corrections consider putting the funding for the criminal justice technician position in its budget as opposed to relying on the CDVSA's budget.

The motion passed without objection.

Ms. Griggs said she would email everyone about scheduling a half-day teleconference meeting to review the RFP responses for the VOCA Recovery Act funding.

Mr. Svobodny inquired if reviewing the RFP applications could be combined with the quarterly meeting in September. Ms. Griggs said she thought so because the applications would be simpler to review than other RFPs. Ms. TePas added that if the funding requests total more than the money available (\$504,000), then the Council would likely get into more in-depth discussion about allocating the funding.

There was a short exchange among the Council members and staff about the suitability of August 28 or August 31 to review RFPs. August 31 was tentatively selected, and Ms. Griggs said she would contact everyone with the meeting specifics.

Ms. Griggs reminded the Council that in June they had asked staff to build into the budget travel funds for holding one meeting in a rural area in response to a legislative task force report recommendation. She did prepare an estimate for travel to a rural area and included the amount in the FY10 budget.

Ms. Griggs reported that the Sexual Assault Services Program (SASP) new formula grant funding has not been distributed to the programs yet because she is waiting for information about when the grant ends. Once she has that, she will know whether the funding is for one year or can be divided into two years.

BYLAWS SUBCOMMITTEE AND APPEALS COMMITTEE

Chair House assigned herself, Col. Holloway and Melissa Stone to the Appeals Committee.

SEPTEMBER QUARTERLY MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

Council members considered Kodiak, Bethel and Kotzebue as rural meeting sites for the September meeting. Ms. Griggs indicated that her research showed it would cost \$7,000 to \$10,000 more to hold a meeting in a rural area versus Juneau or Anchorage.

Mr. Svobodny suggested that the Council set aside time on the agenda for people in whatever rural community is selected as a meeting site to talk to the Council.

Ms. TePas mentioned that the sexual assault response team (SART) training is scheduled for September 21-25, 2009 in Bethel and would likely take up significant hotel space during that period. She encouraged any Council members who wished to attend the training to do so.

Col. Holloway said he might be able to have the Alaska State Troopers post supervisor give a presentation at the Council meeting about what is going on in the area.

Ms. Griggs suggested selecting two rural locations and staff could check what events or other activities might be going on at the same time as the CDVSA September quarterly meeting that might impact getting lodging, etc.

After input from other Council members, Chair House designated Kodiak and Bethel as the two potential meeting sites for staff to check on.

The meeting date was set for Thursday, September 17, 2009.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Svobodny requested that the September meeting agenda include discussion about changing the bylaws. Two issues are whether the chair should have a vote where there is not a tie and, with the addition of two members to the Council to make a total of nine, whether the quorum should be five instead of the current four in the bylaws.

Col. Holloway brought up a question of whether the bylaws contained any direction about the process for hiring an executive director. He asked that the Council consider whether it wanted that type of documentation because it would keep the process consistent.

Mr. Svobodny acknowledged that it was a fair thing to discuss. He added that the bylaws state that the hiring decision is the Council's, not the commissioner's or the governor's decision.

An unidentified female stated that she would also like to see the guidelines for the chair's

responsibilities because she had not seen them.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ms. Stone thanked the subcommittee who worked on selecting a new executive director, noting that it is always a lot of work.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Note: An outside contractor prepared the summary minutes from staff's tape recording of the meeting. For in-depth discussion and presentation details, please refer to tapes of the meeting and staff reports on file at the CDVSA office.

Confidential Office Services
Karen Pearce Brown
Juneau, Alaska